

Application Number 10/755,143
Amendment with Request for Continued Examination

REMARKS

This Amendment accompanies a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). A Notice of Appeal was filed for this case on April 8, 2008. This Amendment and RCE suspends the Appeal process and reopens prosecution.

Applicant does not acquiesce to any of the former rejections, but has nevertheless amended the claims in order to advance prosecution. In particular, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations formerly recited in claim 2. In addition, Applicant has also amended claim 1 to include the limitations formerly recited in claim 11. New dependent claims 23 and 24 have also been added.

Claims 1 and 3-10, 12, 23 and 24 are now pending. Claims 21 and 22 are also pending, but are withdrawn as being directed to non-elected inventions. Non-elected dependent claims 21 and 22 will deserve further consideration as patentably distinct species of claim 1, once independent claim 1 is allowed.

Applicant respectfully traverses the current rejections for at least the following reasons.

As noted, claim 1 has been amended, among other ways, to include the limitations of claim 2. Former dependent claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozue et al. (US 2004/0021982) (hereafter "Ozue"). However, Ozue fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e), and provides no teaching that would have suggested a rational reason to include such features. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 1 patentably distinguishes Ozue.

Furthermore, claim 1 has also been amended to include the limitations formerly recited in claim 11. In particular, claim 1 now requires that each of the write heads includes an excitation coil that coils in a direction perpendicular to a plane defined by the planar array of write heads. Applicant believes that this change also supports patentability such that claim 1 now more clearly recites a collection of elements that are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art.

Claim 1 now recites a system for reading and writing information to magnetic media comprising a planar array of write heads arranged in a two-dimensional matrix, wherein each of the write heads defines a write channel for the system as the magnetic media moves in a direction of motion relative to the planar array of write heads, and wherein each of the write heads includes an excitation coil that coils in a direction perpendicular to a plane defined by the planar array of

Application Number 10/755,143

Amendment with Request for Continued Examination

write heads, and a linear array of magnetoresistive (MR) beads, wherein each of the MR heads defines a read channel for the system, and wherein each of the write heads in the two dimensional matrix corresponds to one of the MR heads of the linear array of MR heads such that each of the write channels corresponds to one of the read channels as the magnetic media moves in the direction of motion.

One illustration of a system like that of claim 1 can be seen in FIG. 2 of the present application, which is reproduced below.





FIG. 2

As shown in FIG. 2, the array of MR heads 14 comprises a linear array of MR heads and the array of write heads 12 comprises a planar array of write heads.

In the Office Action, the Examiner identified FIG. 14 or 15 of Ozue and stated that Ozue discloses an array of write heads 28 and an array of MR heads 46. Regarding former claim 2, the Examiner stated that Ozue shows that the array of MR heads comprises a linear array, and the array of write heads comprises a planar array arranged in a two-dimensional matrix. FIG. 14 of Ozue, which was cited in support of these conclusions, is reproduced below.

Application Number 10/755,143
Amendment with Request for Continued Examination

FIG. 14



It is apparent from FIG. 14 that the Examiner misinterpreted Ozue. The array of MR heads 46 is clearly not a linear array. Quite the opposite, the array of MR heads 46 in Ozue is the same as the array of write heads. Therefore, since the Examiner interpreted the array of write heads to be a planar array arranged in a two-dimensional matrix, the Examiner cannot reasonably contend that the array of read heads is a linear array. Again, the array of MR heads 46 in Ozue is the same as the array of write heads. The array of MR heads 46 is clearly not a linear array. For this reason, amended claim 1 must be allowed over Ozue.

New dependent claims 23 and 24 have been added to this application. New claim 23 requires one or more of the write heads to also function as a read element that reads pre-written servo marks. This claim finds support in paragraph [0041] of the application. Further consideration of the features of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

Application Number 10/755,143

Amendment with Request for Continued Examination

New claim 24 requires separate actuators for the planar array of write heads and the linear array of read heads, wherein servo tracking is performed independently for the planar array of write heads and the linear array of read heads. New claim 24 finds support in paragraph [0046] of the application. Further consideration of the features of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration by the Examiner and allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 09-0069. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

6/2/08

Imation Legal Affairs
P.O. Box 64898
St. Paul, Minnesota 55164-0898
Telephone: (651) 704-3604
Facsimile: (651) 704-5951

By:



Name: Eric D. Levinson
Reg. No.: 35,814